

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the European patent document to Shimizu.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the Shimizu reference in view of the U.S. patent to Chujo.

At the same time the Examiner indicated that claims 3 and 7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Also, the drawings are objected to and the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for the rejection of the claims and the Examiner's indication of the allowability of some claims, which has been gratefully acknowledged, applicants canceled the original claims and submitted a new set of claims 8-13.

Claim 8, the broadest claim on file, defines an electrical machine combining the features of the original claims 1, 2 and 3. Since claim 8 now includes the features of claim 3 which was indicated as allowable by the Examiner, it is believed that claim 8 should now be considered as allowable over the art.

In connection with the Examiner's objections to the drawings and rejections to the claims, applicant use the term "at least one roller bearing" in claim 1 consistently. The expression "declined outwardly" has been clarified by saying that the conical spring-support surface is declined outwardly in a radial direction, which feature can be clearly seen from Figures 2b, 4a and 4b.

Reference numerals 10 and 27 have been added to the drawings. Reference numerals 59 have been used in Figures 3a and 3b instead of reference numerals 47. In connection with the Examiner's indication of the inconsistency between the specification and Figures 4a and 4b identifying the force, the specification on page 7, line 28 has been amended to define the force  $F_2$ . Also, the expression "in particular" has been deleted.

In connection with the Examiner's further questions raised with respect to the functioning back and forth across a flat position of the spring element, the Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to page 5, line 21 in

which the flat position of the spring element 47 is explained as defined to mean that the outer region of the spring element 47 has the same axial position as the inner region of the spring element 47. The spring element 47 is formed as a disc spring and positioned in the electrical machine so that it is possible to convert the spring element 47 first into the shape shown in Figure 4a, in which the spring element 47 with its small axial end abuts against the spring supporting surface, so that with the end having a greater outer diameter the spring element 47 is located at the left side of the spring supporting surface 35 at a distance  $d_1$  from the flat position which is identified as  $l_0$ , the distance is equal zero. In the flat position the spring element 47 is located in the line  $l_0$  with distance  $d_1$  or  $d_2 = 0$ . The spring element 47 can be transferred to a position shown in Figure 4b, in which it is located at the right side of the line  $l_0$  at a distance  $d_2$  from it. It is believed therefore that the meaning of the expression that the spring element, which is formed in a spring disc, functions back and forth across a flat position of the spring element is clear from the above presented explanations and the description provided in the specification.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 8 should be considered as being in allowable condition.

As for claims 9-13, these claims depend on claim 8, they share its allowable features, and therefore they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal aspects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance; he is invited to telephone the undersigned at (631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27233